REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed this application in the light of the Final Office Action mailed November 15, 2006. Claim 2 was previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-23 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 8 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,055,429 issued to Michael R. Lynch ("*Lynch*") in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,617 issued to James David Larsen et al. ("*Larsen*").

Lynch discloses a distributed wireless call processing system that includes a plurality of mobile transceiver units each having the capability to simultaneous receive, reprocess and retransmit a plurality of calls to form a plurality of call paths within the network formed by the units.

Larson discloses a method of transmitting data between stations in a cellular wireless communication system comprising a plurality of mobile stations and a plurality of base stations. Each base station has an effective coverage zone that communicates with other base stations located outside the effective coverage zone via a mobile station. (Col. 1, Lines 49-57). The stations monitor data transmission and adjust transmission power accordingly when relaying a message as not to interfere with the effective zone coverage. (Col. 2, Lines 10-13).

Claims 1 and 13 recites a method comprising the steps "a new subscriber sends a search signal to all subscribers that can be reached and selects a first router from subscribers that respond," "the new subscriber sends a registration request to the first router," "after the registration request from the first router has been forwarded to the central system, the system decides whether to accept or reject the registration request" and "if accepted, the central system sends a response...which contains a subscriber number and a system identifier which is accepted and stored by the new subscriber."

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose every element of Applicants' invention as amended. *Lynch* and *Larson*, alone or in combination, fail to teach at least a method for registering a new subscriber in a radio system having a central system and a plurality of subscribers comprising the steps "a new subscriber sends a search signal to all subscribers that can be reached and selects a first router from subscribers that respond," "the new subscriber sends a registration request to the first router," "after the registration request from the first router has been forwarded to the central system, the system decides whether to accept or reject the registration request" and "if accepted, the central system sends a response...which contains a subscriber number and a system identifier which is accepted and stored by the new subscriber," as recited by Claims 1 and 13.

The Examiner states that *Lynch* discloses the following:

> Each mobile transceiver unit within the present invention system maintains an audit buffer having a plurality of levels within which the location vector...for communication to various other transceiver units may be stored. The organization of this audit buffer facilitates the call vectoring process to a degree that a given transceiver unit is able to audit surrounding units and store their identifications and power levels within the audit buffer in response to a request and thereafter vector a call without unduly delaying the communication.

(Col. 4, Lines 52-63). Applicants' submit the cited reference discloses a subscriber (transceiver unit) searching for other subscribers (surrounding [transceiver] units). However, the cited reference fails to disclose the transceiver unit "select[ing] a first router" from all located surrounding transceiver units as recited by Claims 1 and 13.

Further, the Examiner states that *Larson* discloses the following:

> Since the base station now has a list of all the mobile stations in its area and knows the connectivity of each mobile station it can now allocate resources to any mobile stations when a call is made. It can also change the resource allocation for a mobile station that is midway in a call. This would be necessary if two mobile stations using the same resource move closer together during a call, for example.
>
> If a mobile station hears two different mobile stations that can communicate with two different base stations it will send lists to both base stations via these mobile stations. Therefore mobile stations in outlying areas would show up in the lists of more than one base station. This will allow the

> base stations to hand off a mobile station from one base station to another during a call.

(Col. 8, Lines 44-57). The cited references fails to render obvious Applicants' claims for the following reasons. First, the Examiner argues that the sent *'list'* referenced by *Larson* is analogous to Applicants' *'registration request.'* However, *Larson* merely discloses a mobile station that sends a "***list*** of all the mobile stations it can hear on the random access channel" to a communicating base station. (Col. 8, Lines 10-13). *Larson*, therefore, fails to disclose a new subscriber asking permission to "register" as recited by Applicants' Claims 1 and 13. Second, *Larson* does not disclose, explicitly or inherently, the base station having the option of accepting or rejecting the "list." In contrast, the "mobile station will send the base station a list of all the mobile stations it can hear...[t]he base station will then be able to determine which mobile station it can hear directly and which mobile stations it can reach indirectly by relaying through a mobile station." (Col. 8, Lines 10-17). Finally, *Larson* fails to disclose a method comprising the step "the central system sends a response via the first router which contains a ***subscriber number***" to the new "registering" subscriber as recited in Claims 1 and 13. Instead, *Larson* teaches "the base station...send messages back to the mobile station to tell them how much power to use." (Col. 8, Lines 33-37). *Lynch* and *Larson* fails to disclose the recited claims, and therefore, cannot render obvious Claims 1 and 13.

Given that Claims 3-7, and 9-12 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 14-23 depend from Claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-7, 9-12 and 14-23 are allowable. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-23.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate Examiner's consideration and indication that Claim 8 has been allowed. Applicants will await further decision on the remaining claims before taking further action regarding allowed Claim 8.

CONCLUSION

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful review of the Application. Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and full allowance of Claims 1, 2-7, and 9-23.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Andreas Grubert at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants

Andreas Grubert
Reg. No. 59,143

Date: February 15, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**
512.322.2690
512.322.8383 (fax)